IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.12122 of 2007

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JUNE TWO THOUSAND AND SEVEN

Between:

Dr. M.R. Reddy College of Education, Dr. M.R. Reddy Road, Parkal Village & Mandal, Warangal District, Rep. by its Principal Dr. M. Raja Reddy, S/o. Buchi Reddy.

… Petitioner

And

The National Council for Teacher Education, Southern Regional Committee, 1st Floor, CSD Building, HMT Post, Bangalore – 560 031, Rep. by its Regional Director, and another.

… Respondents

Order:

Petitioner, a college of education, has filed this Writ Petition questioning the order dated 15-05-2007, passed by the first respondent – National Council for Teacher Education, in Proc.No.F.SRO/NCTE/M.Ed/ 2006-07/2806, rejecting its proposal to

start M. Ed. Course for the academic year 2007-08.

2. In the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition, it is stated that petitioner submitted representation dated 25-12-2005 to the first respondent seeking permission to start the aforesaid course. It is stated that petitioner has got its own building and adequate infrastructure to start the said course. The case of the petitioner is that pursuant to the notice dated 14-03-2007 issued by the first respondent though it has submitted representation dated 03-04-2007 stating that it has recruited requisite staff, created reserve fund for five years and also possesses requisite equipment, however, the impugned order has been passed refusing permission to start the said course on the ground that accommodation, laboratory and library facilities are inadequate.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel appearing for the first respondent.

4. The reasons assigned in the impugned order are vague and incapable of being complied by the petitioner. If for any reason the proposal submitted by an applicant is to be rejected, plausible reasons have to be assigned for such rejection and the applicant has to be made known the areas in which further improvement is necessary.
But, in the impugned order it is merely stated that no adequate accommodation and facilities are provided.

5. In that view of the matter, the order under challenge is liable to be set aside and it is accordingly set aside. I deem it a fit case to give an opportunity to the petitioner make another representation giving the particulars of accommodation, laboratory and library facilities provided to the students. Petitioner is permitted to make a representation in this

regard, to the first respondent, within a period of two weeks from today. On such representation being made, respondents shall consider the matter afresh and pass appropriate orders, by making re-inspection, if necessary, with regard to compliance of the objections raised in the impugned order, by collecting fees as prescribed under the Rules, and pass appropriate orders as expeditiously as possible.

6. The Writ Petition is disposed of with the above observations and directions. No order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

June 20, 2007
N.B. Furnish C.C. tomorrow
B.O.
MRR